Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XIV. No. 3. NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER, 1900. Whole No. 365.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."
JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

Mr. Yarros's article on "Trusts and Democratic Doctrine," printed in this issue, was written months ago, but the lesson which it teaches has lost little of its timeliness.

The other day a friend of mine walked into the book department of one of the largest department stores in New York, and asked the young woman behind the counter: "Have you 'A Chambermaid's Diary'?" "Yes," she answered, "you can get it over there," pointing across the store. My friend went "over there," and found nothing but the stationery department. Going back to the young woman, he said: "I don't find any books 'over there'." "Oh!" she exclaimed, "is it a book?" "Yes," said he. And the young woman replied: "Why! I thought you wanted a diary for a chambermaid."

Bishop Potter is opposed to compulsory arbitration because it "embraces an element of coercion that weakens the whole fabric." But he prefers compulsory arbitration to a strike. He "would willingly acquiesce in compulsory arbitration if by that means" he "could avert the suffering, starvation, and strife attendant upon the usual strike." In other words, Bishop Potter would rather weaken the whole fabric by coercion, and thus induce continual and universal suffering and ultimate ruin, than allow laborers their right of choice between temporary suffering and submission to an employer's exactions. However, it is of little consequence what Bishop Potter thinks. The belief that he is more worthy of trust than most of his fellow-clergy was shattered when a few days in the Philippines made the bishop an imperialist.

G. Bernard Shaw and E. Belfort Bax have been discussing, in the "Saturday Review," the question whether State Socialism is essentially republican. The affirmative is held by Bax, who believes that State Socialism means liberty, and that there is no liberty outside of republicanism. The negative is held by Shaw, who knows that State Socialism is tyranny but favors it nevertheless, and that it is consistent with any form of government, all forms being tyrannical. Of course Shaw is right. He hugs no illusions: he is not to be taken in by the theory that majority rule means liberty; he frankly espouses tyranny, because, mistakenly supposing that men cannot be both free and well-fed, he would rather have them well-fed than free. Since Anarchy cannot have Shaw for a champion, the next best thing for the cause is to have him as a conspicuous foe. For there are still some men who would rather be free than well-fed, and these will be saved to Anarchy by Shaw's exhibition of State Socialism as tyranny.

Mr. Albert F. Davis, 181 Weybosset street, Providence, R. I., is the proprietor of a bookstore and a circulating library of seven thousand volumes, and fully realizes his responsibility. Being visited by my travelling salesman in advance of the publication of "A Chambermaid's Diary," and having read the circular descriptive of the book, he ordered a copy. Afterward he returned the book without paying for it, sending with it the following letter: "My librarian denounce your book The Chambermaid's Diary as being a book we do not want for library, or it is not fit to put in hands of a customer. Therefore I return the one copy you sent me in paper by same mail this goes by. I do not wish to lore the standard of morality." A man of giant intellect may be very weak in orthography and syntax. Nevertheless, observation of such lapses as this letter reveals in one who, by his position at the head of a circulating library, assumes the attitude of moral and literary mentor to a university town compels the reflection that *noblesse oblige*.

Mr. Byington's views of the marriage contract, expressed in this issue, seem to me sound, and their promulgation is useful as helping, by one more application, to an understanding of Anarchism. I take exception only to Mr. Byington's idea that the subject is one of immediate practical importance. This idea grows out of his general conception of Anarchist society as something yet to be started. The fact is that Anarchist society was started thousands of years ago, when the first glimmer of the idea of liberty dawned upon the human mind, and has been advancing ever since,—not steadily advancing, to be sure, but fitfully, with an occasional reversal of the current. Mr. Byington looks upon the time when a jury of Anarchists shall sit, as a point not far from the beginning of the history of Anarchy's growth, whereas I look upon that time as a point very near the end of that history. The introduction of more Anarchy into our economic life will have made marriage a thing of the past long before the first drawing of a jury of Anarchists to pass upon any contract whatsoever.

In "Justice," the Single Tax organ published at Wilmington, Del., Mr. Edward T. Burleigh has lately been guilty of a singular solecism. He conducts a department in that paper under the heading of "Sayings and Doings," and in the issue of December 7 he began it with this sentence: "Last August, in 'Equity,' Mr. Josiah Warren had an article entitled 'Cost and Value.'" Then Mr. Burleigh proceeded to give extracts from the article, interspersing them with criticisms. This is very much as if I were to say: "Last August, in 'Nature,' Mr. Charles Darwin had an article entitled 'The Origin of Species,'" and were then to publish, as extracts from this article, voluminous citations from Darwin's book, "The Origin of Species," and criticise them. In other words, Mr. Burleigh supposes himself to be debating with an obscure individual living in the present, instead of with one of the world's great men, who laid the foundations of an enduring fame more than half a century ago. Astounding as it may seem, Mr. Burleigh, an eminent Single Taxer of high Abolition lineage, is so unfamiliar with the history of the labor movement and the liberty movement that he does not know that Josiah Warren was the first man to expound and formulate the doctrine now known as Anarchism; the first man to clearly state the theory of individual sovereignty and equal liberty; the author of a work, entitled "True Civilization," published sixty years ago or more, which contains, in rather clumsy arrangement but very accurately thought out, nearly all the truths of importance now to be found in advanced modern works on politics and economics; and the "remarkable American" whom John Stuart Mill, in his autobiography, couples with Wilhelm von Humboldt in an acknowledgment of indebtedness for his views of liberty. And, as a result of this historical ignorance, we find Mr. Burleigh in the ridiculous position of assuring his readers that "Mr. Warren's heart seems to be in the right place," and of attempting to teach the doctrine of equal freedom *to its author*.

Liberty.

Monthly; Twelve Numbers, 60 Cents; Twenty four Numbers, $1.00; Single Copies, 5 Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 19 Park Place.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. BOX 1312, New York.

NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER, 1900.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel."—PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Marriage and Kindred Contracts.

I want to make a certain inquiry into the status of marriage in an Anarchist society, and to see how far other Anarchists agree with my conclusions. I do not mean to discuss the question of monogamy versus variety, or anything of that sort. I have a simpler problem, based on the same consideration that I have emphasized in former articles,—the consideration that Anarchist society must be started while there are still many persons holding conservative opinions on all subjects, and that, as long as there continue to be many men of many minds, so long Anarchist society must have a plan for their all living together. Apply this to the marriage question. We have to expect that, when Anarchist society is established, there will be some persons who believe in that kind of free love which its enemies will always call promiscuity, others who believe in monogamy and in consecrating wedlock by a marriage ceremony in the traditional form of the Episcopal church, and others who, whatever their private views, find it more respectable or more profitable to follow the latter usage. Now, suppose that such a ceremony is made the basis of a claim which, if allowed, will affect a case that is presented to an Anarchist jury for decision. What effect, if any, can the jury allow to that ceremony?

In the first place, the ceremony is a contract between the parties. If entered into in the Anarchist society, it is a free contract. If entered into in the present society, it is free enough not to be, in general, annulled on the ground of duress. In most cases it is as freely entered into as other contracts in general. The only compulsion that is really felt is the non-invasive compulsion of public opinion. Therefore, if we give effect to other contracts, we shall give effect to this too, unless special reason is shown to the contrary.

We will notice, for our caution, that it is a tolerably complicated contract. There are obligations on both sides that bear purely on the person: "love, honor, and obey," "forsaking all others, keep you only to her so long as you both shall live." There are others of property: "with all my worldly goods I thee endow," and all that body of property-determinations that is implied in the more words "take thee to be my lawfully-wedded wife or husband." The latter blanket-clause also purports to establish the joint control of the children.

Now, I see no difficulty in the way of acknowledging all claims of property based on the marriage partnership, just as in the case of any other partnership. However the jurymen may hate the institution of marriage, they cannot, as Anarchists, assume to declare the contract void as being *contra bonos mores* or opposed to public policy. If it were a bare question of this contract alone, they might, if they chose, refuse to be concerned in enforcing any part of it. But, if there is some other issue which they cannot afford to leave undecided, and their decision must in part depend on whether this rabbit is the property of A or of B, I do not see how the jury can declare it the property of A when a free contract of A's, which the jury may or may not like, has declared it B's. The contract as to property is sometimes more favorable to the husband, sometimes to the wife; but it is every one's business to look out for himself whether he gets bitten in a voluntary contract.

The same principles hold with regard to the children,—at least for us emulators of Zendos, who count babies as property. The Comradeship of Free Socialists may answer that part of the question for themselves. When the children are old enough to make a promise, we agree, they choose their own protectors and directors.

The hitch comes in the personal obligations of marriage. The most orthodox courts have always felt that there was great hardship in enforcing these obligations on those who found them intolerable. Can we treat this part of the contract just as we do other contracts?

The question is, rather, whether we shall treat it just as we do other contracts that bind the person.

Take a shovelful of personal contracts, and look at them together. A agrees, for no matter what consideration, not to leave his bed as long as he lives; not to leave his house within twenty years; not to go outside Rhode Island within three years; never in his life to set foot in Rhode Island; not to be found in Rhode Island within one week; to do carpenter's work in B's house Tuesday forenoon; to work his life long at carpentering for B, B's heirs and assigns; to obey all orders whatsoever which he may ever receive from B, B's heirs and assigns; not to have sexual connection with any one but B, till death or divorce has parted him from B. Is there reason for treating one of these contracts differently from another?

I answer, there is not. An essential part of liberty is that one shall not be subject to the decrees of his past. I have nothing against keeping good resolutions, but one must not force me to keep them, even if he is an interested party. To enforce against the person the worst of the contracts in that list would be absolute slavery. To enforce against the person the lightest of them might involve all that is most intolerable of slavery. I hold that there is no contract in which the personal performance of an obligation can properly be compelled by force applied to the person.

On the other hand, title to property passes by contract. If a man binds himself to forfeit certain property to me if he crosses the boundaries of Rhode Island,—or of wedlock,—then, as soon as the bond is executed, and thenceforth, I have a conditional title to that property. If he exercises his right to change his mind, that does not make void the partial title I have already acquired to what are already, to the extent of that title, my goods.

Now, a contract for personal service might expressly provide that, in case of non-performance, the delinquent should forfeit a certain specified property, or should be liable to no penalty at all, or should forfeit an amount to be determined by damage sustained, ability to pay, or other circumstances. If no such provision is expressed, but it is a uniform custom that a certain one of these principles is followed in a certain class of contracts, then that custom is part of the meaning of such a contract. If the man who promises to mend my door Tuesday receives his pay and does not come, custom makes him liable to me for the damages I may thereby suffer. Well, then, when he tells me that he will come, it is part of the natural meaning of his language that he will pay such damages in such case. In like manner the words "I take thee to be my lawfully-wedded wife" have, as part of their meaning, "I will pay thee alimony if thou gettest a divorce from me for adultery," and are always understood so to mean. And in claiming alimony she is only claiming her own, provided that the alimony is paid out of property which (or whose equivalent) the husband held while the marriage contract was still accepted on both sides, and has held ever since. But I do not see what claim she has on property acquired by her husband's industry or luck since he has notified her that he will have no more of that marriage, or since she has shown that she has regarded the marriage tie as broken.

My conclusion is, then, that the marriage contract is exactly as valid as any other contract; that those parts of it which relate to property are to be treated like any other contract of property; that those parts which impose a personal obligation are to be treated like any other contract of personal obligation; that the interpretation of this last is, it is

crime to enforce them against the person, but property damages may be claimed for their breach, provided these damages do not draw upon the increment of the payer's estate since a date later than the breaking off of the contract. I do not see in what form to draw up the papers for proceeding before an Anarchist jury against one who has persuaded another to break a contract of personal service, although I could not, in general, commend his action.

I would not be understood as having argued in favor of the collection of debts by force. It is one thing to decide that a disputed claim is valid, and another thing is to set about enforcing it.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

W. D. Howells on Liberty.

"Liberty and Equity" was the subject of a lecture delivered at Boston some time ago by the distinguished novelist and humanitarian, William D. Howells. Evidently Mr. Howells has learned nothing and forgotten nothing with reference to the meaning of liberty since 1896, when a magazine article of his, dealing with the same questions, was criticised and corrected in these columns. But, as Mr. Howells is essentially fair-minded and open to correction, it may be profitable to subject his ideas to another examination.

Liberty, declares Mr. Howells, "is never good in itself. It is a means to something good. It is forever merging into something else." This statement may be granted. Liberty is a means to happiness, to the free exercise of one's faculties. Liberty is absence of restraint, and restraint is interference with actions that give pleasure or avert pain. The man who is placed behind prison bars sighs and longs for freedom, because freedom means movement, the satisfaction of desires, the doing of agreeable things. It is not true, however, that, in the struggle or ardent wish for freedom, the end is always clearly kept in view. It is a familiar psychological fact that the means to an end become a mediate end. It is sufficient to mention money,—a mere means to an end, but generally thought of as an end in itself.

But what follows from the definition given by Mr. Howells? Certainly not that freedom is unnecessary or superfluous or useless. Mr. Howells continues:

> We are all deluded by the rhetorical idea of liberty—largely political. The dream of infinite and immutable liberty is the hallucination of the Anarchist—that is, the individualist—gone mad. The moment liberty in this meaning is achieved, we should have a rule, not of the wisest, but of the strongest, and so no liberty at all. So far as we can see, liberty is merely choice, and, as such, is the power of self-sacrifice, for this is the act only of those who are free.

It is really inexcusable in Mr. Howells to misconceive the "dream of the Anarchist" so absurdly. Infinite and immutable liberty for all is impossible. Such liberty for some would naturally imply slavery for others. But the Anarchist does not demand infinite liberty for himself or anybody. He demands *equal liberty*. Does Mr. Howells perceive the distinction? Under equal liberty—that is, under the highest liberty of each compatible with the equal liberty of all—there can be no rule of the strongest. Aggression by strong (or weak, for that matter) would violate equality of liberty, and would be Archy, not Anarchy. Mr. Howells is a strenuous advocate of equality. He will be glad to know that the Anarchists whom he affects to abhor sum up the law and the prophets in the demand for equality of liberty.

With regard to self-sacrifice, liberty is undoubtedly, among other things, the power of self-sacrifice, for it is choice, as Mr. Howells says, and a free man may choose to sacrifice himself, if that be posssible, which it is in a superficial sense. A profounder study of the things behind words would open Mr. Howells's eyes to the fact that the man who sacrifices himself *asserts himself*. And under equal liberty it will be unnecessary for any individual to "give up some part of his freedom for the common good." The common good requires no such surrender. It is subserved by the enjoyment of equal freedom. A man will be able to give up a part of his property to an unfortunate fellow-man, but that will involve no sacrifice of liberty.

Mr. Howells is very much concerned about freedom from want. But political liberty in the wide sense of the term (not in the sense of a change of masters or of substitution of many despots for a few) is a means to economic opportunity, to freedom from want for all who are able and willing to use opportunity. The end to which liberty is a means includes equality of opportunity. Indeed, there can be no monopoly under equal liberty, for privilege not freely conferred is aggression, a denial of liberty to those aggressed upon.

I hope Mr. Howells will revise his lecture in the light of these simple explanations.

V. Y.

Points from a Printer.

"How is it," I queried of a typo, "that Tammany and its chief have such power?"

"I've been with Tammany for years," he replied, "and I must say it has a most effective machine. Its members are absolutely whipped into line. They have *got* to do what they are told."

"Why so?"

"Well, take the immense number of political jobs,—street, dock, sewer, water, police, etc.,—the holders of which must line up with Tammany, pay assessments, attend meetings, and go on parade. They, again, have their friends and relatives, who, it is expected, will be kept in harmony. Then there is the free and easy element, who do not want to be pestered with the petty exactions of the 'reformers.'"

"What of the Republican party? Has it no machine?"

"Oh, yes. And a good one."

"Where does its support come from?"

"From the army, navy, postal, and customs departments, immigration bureaus, and various commissions appointed by the State and nation."

"By the way, what do you think of the municipal printing office project?"

"Good idea. I see Coler is favoring it."

Thus our printer friend, though advancing the very best reasons why government should not be increased, advocates it. And why? First, because the government is an easy taskmaster, and, second, because a small portion of the city printing is done in a "rat" office. As to the first, it may be well said that no position is good in any sense, if it take from the holder his freedom as above described. The printer who accepts such conditions is a political rat, far more dangerous than the industrial rat. As to the second, it is just possible that the city printing now done in the various offices keeps some of them within the union fold. Boston has a municipal printing plant. Up to last election in that city it was a part of the Democratic machine; now it is Republican. Formerly the printers paid assessments to Mayor Josiah Quincy's gang; now, no doubt, they will contribute to Mayor Hart's. But the city saved money by the change, we are told. Possibly; it was an experiment. But the government printing office at Washington is no experiment. As a sample only of its success, when Public Printer Benedict took charge, under Cleveland, he found printers standing in each other's way. All good Republicans. He reduced the force by wholesale. Recently a printer employed there, appointed by Democratic influence, met the writer, when it was learned that he had gone into the McKinley camp, just as Ed McSweeney, of the Immigration Bureau at New York, found it convenient to do. Or Terence V. Powderly, or John McMackin, once the Single Tax leader under George, but now chief of the Bureau of Labor Statistics under Roosevelt. Then we have the Industrial Commission, another wing of the Republican machine, and upon which the printers are represented by an ex-rat. Or the Bureau of Labor at Washington, whose chief, Carroll D. Wright, has been recently treating us to prosperity statistics and trust rot. Coler himself is a victim of the machine, and yet he would enlarge it.

* * *

Imperialism impelled the writer to vote, for the first time in seven years. It is true, various increase of government was favored by certain allies of Bryan, such as nationalization of banking, railways, telegraph, telephone; yet the danger thereof was remote, and could be fought later, while the evils of Republicanism—standing army, suppression of strikers, conquest, foreign alliance, injunc-

tion, tariffs, the money power—were immediate. It was certainly a contest of the oppressed against their oppressors, with possibility of the latter becoming more arrogant. It meant not only murder in the Philippines, but at home as well. Striking miners now parade the highways with hands overhead to give no plausible excuse for shooting, while deputies glare upon them savagely. "Where are the damned strikers?" asked the voting militia, as they came into a Pennsylvania town recently, insulting women right and left. Whether Anarchists sympathize with trade unions or not, they do not question one's right to quit work, assemble, discuss, and publish. It was, then, a question of self-defence to-day,—for some, at least, with their chances considerably lessened if McKinleyism won.

Voting is not right, 'tis true; but the evil of it in this instance was not to be compared to the evils it was directed against. That's the way it looked.

***

Ordinarily trade unions cannot raise wages by prevailing methods, it is agreed by economic students. They may do so in some places and trades, but it is done at the expense of all other tradesmen, who must pay the increased prices that follow. But are there not many industries of a monopolistic character in which an increase of wages does not mean increase of prices,—such as newspaper, magazine, and book publishing, which frequently get returns out of all proportion to the labor expended? Also, railway, telegraph, telephone, typesetting machines, bicycles, automobiles, presses, all patented machinery, and coal and iron mining. And may it not be said that the rentals of buildings are not fixed by the wages paid to the carpenters, masons, painters, plasterers? How many industries are there in which a natural or monopolistic advantage exists, and in the field of which trade unions may legitimately contend and make actual gains?

***

All government is imperialism, whether in the Philippines or in America. Our consent is not required here any more than there.

Edward Atkinson figures that the cost of expansion, when taxed upon our products, will prevent us from competing with England, Germany, and France, thus losing us a far larger market than could possibly be gained.

The New York "Press" (November 6) had a long editorial on Anarchy, which showed a better grasp of the subject than usually is found, although we learned that Anarchy's leader is a Quaker who would exalt man above God. Rather a strange diciple of the fanatic Fox.

The "Commercial Advertiser" also had an interesting article on the same subject, by Dr. ———.

The "Typographical Journal," of October 15, contained: "What Is Anarchy?" by the writer, which has been surprisingly well received.

To hear such printers as Boulton, Quinby, and Williams shouting that trade unions must go into politics, and ridiculing those printers who placed their principles ahead of trade unions, was a surprise at this late day. A moment's reflection must convince them that they are the rankest kind of imperialists, while they denounce imperialism in others.

In answer to Miss Atherton's plea that a law be enacted excluding Anarchists, the Brooklyn "Eagle" replied that it was the absence of law that discouraged Anarchy, and it was just such laws as she proposed that would make all of us Anarchists.

Since the lockout the New York "Sun" is set up on a piece system, whereby the leaded, or reading matter, goes to the piece-hands, and the "phat," or advertisements, goes to a few time-hands. The "rats" can now work any number of hours they please, and are doing it seven days a week and thirteen hours a day. AUG. MCCRAITH.

Anarchistic Hennessys.

There are people who, though in theory violently hostile to all religion and especially to the Catholic religion, cannot be induced to eat meat on Friday. I am reminded of these on election day when I see an Anarchist going to the ballot-box. The unbeliever who one day in the week changes his diet, thinking that there is just a chance, after all, that he may save his soul thereby, does not differ much from my Anarchist friend McCraith, who one day in the year, or even one day in seven years, grasps at a ghost of a chance to save his country. And what difference there is is in favor of the unbeliever; for eating fish is an innocent act, while voting is a criminal one. I am willing to be a criminal when the excuse is sufficient. But, if I have in view an end so important as to justify, say, the commission of murder, I at any rate, before acting, must first be satisfied beyond a doubt that the murder will achieve the end in view. One must feel unpleasantly at having been a criminal in vain. I do not envy my friend McCraith's state of mind when, on the morning after election, he realizes that, as Mr. Dooley predicted, America is "no better off Wensdah than it was Choosdah," and that, while he has not freed his fellow-laborers from the burden of a standing army, he himself must bear henceforth the uncomfortable consciousness of the stain of blood upon his hands.

I used to be connected with a newspaper that went to press every Tuesday night, and the blunders that were sure to be conspicuous in the printed sheet were known in the office as "Wednesday morning surprises." Very painful indeed must be the Wednesday morning surprises of the voting Anarchists, who, in spite of their Anarchist faith, are, after all, but so many Mr. Hennessys taking Mr. Dooley all too seriously when he says: "It is f'r ye to decide next Choosdah whether th' flag iv this counthry shall be dhragged in th' mire or left to lay there; whether this counthry shall take its place among th' nations iv th' earth, or somewan else's; whether ye shall wurruk at a dollar an' a half a day f'r th' thrusts or f'r the men composin' th' thrusts. Whin ye go into th' sacred temple iv American pathreetism in Mulligan's barber shop, an' th' high priest iv constitootyonal rights, Sarsfield Darsey, that was took up last year f'r stealing coal, hands ye th' ballot that makes all men free, I bid ye thrust aside with riverent hands th' curtains iv th' holy cell on ye'er right, near th' cigar case, utter a brief prayer, an' find th' lead pencil. It's up to ye to settle this question wanst an' f'r all again. Poor, poor Hinnissy, what a weight is on ye'er bowed shoulders; what cinchries to come must be guided be ye'er ability to make a mark in the dark with th' stub iv a pencil in Mulligan's barber shop. Countless generations yet unborn, as they pick up th' mornin' pa-aper an' r-read iv another battle in th' Ph'lippeens, or dig down in their pockets an' find nawthin' but silver there at thirty cints a bushel, may curse or bless ye'er name. Little do ye reck or calc'late or even think iv th' consequinces. If ye don't spile ye'er ballot, ye may be condimin' the ages to servichood." T.

Gertrude Atherton's Mistakes.

When the unique proposition of Gertrude Atherton that all persons suspected of being Anarchists be imprisoned until proved not to be, and that all persons pretending or proved to be Anarchists be imprisoned for life either in jails or insane asylums, appeared in the New York "Journal," I, in common with many other Anarchists of my acquaintance who had admired Mrs. Atherton's previous contributions to that disreputable newspaper, was amazed beyond measure. Having written so much that is Anarchistic herself, it was hard to understand why she should be so eager to be placed "in durance vile." Some of us thought that she was dishonest; for my part, I was convinced that she was in utter ignorance of the Anarchistic doctrine. The one fact that she classed as Anarchist Ex-Governor Altgeld, whose tendencies are strongly in the direction of State Socialism and who, on the whole, is more Archistic than either Wm. J. Bryan or Grover Cleveland, showed clearly that she was writing at random.

My theory was vindicated a few weeks later, when Mrs. Atherton (see her two articles on another page) reestablished her reputation for honesty and candor by taking it all back. Her correspondence with a western Anarchist (I guessed his identity at once; he has done good work before, by similar methods) had shown her that she was far astray. But her correspondent has not finished his task. Mrs. Atherton still has much to learn about Anarchy. Anarchy is some-

what more than "the training of human character and mind to such a state of moral perfection that there will be no inclination to break the laws which have been invented to protect society from the selfish and half-civilized tendencies of man." Anarchy is, first of all, the abolition of the laws which have been invented by the selfish and half-civilized tendencies of man to enable them to prey upon society, and, through such abolition, the development of new social conditions amid which the human character and mind may have a better chance of attaining perfection. Apparently Mrs. Atherton conceives of Archy only as interference with the individual's personal habits Which of course it is. But Archy's still more objectionable side is its interference with the individual's economic energies,—its denial of freedom in banking, of freedom to "squat" upon unoccupied land, and of general freedom of production and exchange.

As one of her admirers, I counsel Mrs. Atherton to begin a study of political economy in the light of the Anarchistic doctrine of equal liberty. When she has done that, and consequently has begun to realize the enormity of the economic restrictions above referred to, and for whose benefit they are instituted, and by whom they are enforced, she will no longer regard as "noisome vermin" the people who suffer from these restrictions and who think that they can throw them off (as they are entitled to do) by assassinating kings and presidents. She will perceive, to her astonishment, that they are simply mistaken, but excellent, people, just as she herself is excellent and mistaken. T.

Trusts and Democratic Doctrine.

It has been claimed by one or two Socialists that the declaration of principles put forth by the second national conference on trusts, held at Chicago early in February by men who viewed the first conference with suspicion and were dissatisfied with its outcome, is a triumph for Callectivism and a defeat for the Single Taxers and the old-fashioned Democrats. There were Single Taxers among the delegates, and also, I believe, in the platform committee; and presumably some Jeffersonian Democrats had miraculously secured representation, if not on the committee, at least at the conference. After an all-day fight a resolution and address to the public were adopted, and it was with reference to these that the boast just referred to was made. But is it warranted by the substance of the formulated programme?

Unfortunately it is. It is impossible to discover even a trace of Jeffersonian Democracy or of libertarian philosophy in the remedies proposed by the conference of which Ex-Governor Altgeld and George Fred. Williams were leading spirits. Yet in a speech delivered at a mass meeting held in conjunction with the conference Mr. Williams called upon "honest individualists" of all schools to make common cause with him and his associates, and work for the application of the remedies recommended by the resolution. The object, he averred, was the removal of barriers and obstacles, and surely the most consistent individualist might co-operate in such an enterprise. Mr. Williams's challenge deserves some attention. He spoke earnestly, and evidently thought that he was defending human liberty!

The question as to whether trusts can or should be dealt with as a separate problem may be passed over. Let us assume that the conference was right in the main in considering trusts as something irredeemably vicious, to be abolished at all hazards. What are the methods suggested? The resolution demands four things,—namely:

1. Nationalization of the railways and the telegraphs.

2. The placing upon the free list of all raw materials that enter into the production of any trust-controlled article.

3. The adoption of the referendum, or the system of direct legislation by the people.

The second plank need not detain us. It is weak, lame, and halting, but it is at least libertarian in nature and direction. Considering the growth of trusts and the absorption by them of nearly ninety per cent. of the manufacturing industries, a Democratic conference might be expected to demand complete freedom of trade.

Taking the first plank, what connection is there between the trusts and the telegraph? How does private control and operation of the telegraph lines promote monopoly in production? Would men really desirous of maintaining the greatest amount of industrial liberty go out of their way to demand the substitution of a government telegraph monopoly for a private monopoly which, bad and oppressive as it is, is not without redeeming traits which no government enterprise ever presents?

For the nationalization of the railroads there is offered a reason or an excuse. It is said that, despite the interstate commerce law, there is secret discrimination in rates in favor of large shippers and powerful combinations. Railroads, as common carriers with special privileges from government, are required to treat all customers alike, and, if they violate this condition of the grant and give rebates or make special rates to the trusts, an illegitimate advantage is thus conferred upon the latter,—an advantage which must be accounted no inconsiderable factor in fostering the multiplication and strengthening the grip of the combinations. Government ownership and operation would remove this factor.

This is the argument. It is plausible, but scarcely one that genuine lovers of freedom would advance. Consider the gaps and jumps. In the first place, no one knows the extent of the secret rebates and favors. They are doubtless extended, but what ground has anybody for supposing that they constitute an important favoring condition of trust development? Does any one assert that trusts would not exist but for railroad discrimination? Yet on mere and sheer conjecture there is based a demand for the nationalization of the railroads! In the second place, the secret and illicit rebates are not granted to trusts alone. The weaker railroads make special rates to the small shippers, whom they are glad to attract, the competition for traffic being notoriously desperate. Indeed, the cutting of rates usually proceeds from the struggling and semi-bankrupt lines. If the trusts are aided by the big railroads, their competitors are helped by the small. Quite likely the balance is on the side of the trusts, but is it heavy enough to warrant the drastic measure of nationalization?

Finally, it is pure assumption that the abuse complained of, illegal favoritism, cannot be eradicated otherwise. Certainly true Jeffersonians would first exhaust all methods compatible with the principle of minimum government and maximum liberty, and would try to do away with an evil of unknown proportions by some other means than an enormous increase of the sphere of government monopoly and activity. The readiness, the eagerness, to resort to nationalization does not argue any faith in or devotion to liberty, any distrust and jealousy of the State.

I come to the third plank,—the referendum. Untrammelled majority rule is democracy, but not Jeffersonian Democracy. The latter recognizes the necessity of shielding minorities and individuals from the tyranny of the majority. All the restrictions upon the power of "the people" imbedded in the constitution were conceived in and prompted by the desire to protect individual freedom. If these restrictions are swept out of existence, and the majority is to rule absolutely, there will be established a democracy radically different from that contemplated by Jefferson.

How, then, can honest and consistent individualists respond to Mr. Williams's appeal, and co-operate with him and his party? To them, indeed, the conference was a disheartening, painful, and sickening spectacle. Not one of the substantial proposals for the destruction of alleged monopoly libertarian in character! All, all the speakers, without exception, who professed to represent Democracy were prepared for a vast installment of State Socialism, and not one even remembered the fundamental doctrine of original and genuine democracy, which was not far removed from the doctrines of those Mr. Williams appealed to in the name of liberty and individualism.

Why do the present-day Democrats take the name of Jefferson in vain? Jefferson was really a philosophical Anarchist, while Mr. Williams and Bryan are Paternalists and half-State Socialists. How can they expect liberty-loving and logical people to co-operate with them? V. Y.

Irrelevancies.

For the saying that "a man is as old as he feels, but a woman is as old as she looks," there is, perhaps, a more profound *raison d'être* than one's first feeling discovers. It may be accepted as a pleasantry designed to certify that the world has no use for a woman who doesn't "look right"; but it is doubtful whether it would ever have come to be a saying at all if woman had not always been a step farther from conscious, deliberate egoism than man. The world has a place for a man, however he looks,—work for him, a sphere for him, and respectful attention to him because he fills that sphere. Isn't it usually the first question asked about the woman: "Is she good-looking?" Mrs. Whitney has a character who was never called pretty, as a child, but of her as a woman they said: "Desire was just beautiful—she never stopped to be pretty." Women usually stop to be pretty—if they can. They lose time, stopping. And they may fail,—are sure to fail at last,—for no beauty that can be stopped for endures to the end, if the end be long delayed. If women were once to betake themselves to realizing life—feeling it—with less care about their external presentment—and let themselves look to the world as they chanced to,—would they not, perhaps, come to have that part in life which belongs to those who take part in it,—to the actors on the stage, not the *décolleté* audience in the boxes who are there to be focussed with the opera-glasses.

It often seems as if there were as few satisfying books to read as there are satisfying people to know. But, if one has learned to take books as one takes each new acquaintance, as one takes each new Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday, looking, not for satisfaction, but for moments of good understanding, of responsiveness, for breathing-times of rest or stimulus, then one can find books to read. With conflicting feelings—as the old and the new conflict—we leave George Sand's "Jacques." The hero is a very human man, with much about him that one loves not to see—certain conventional ideas, among other things. But, as sometimes happens in this queer mixed world of queer mixed men, he has also good qualities very startling in their rarity. He is about to marry Fernande, with whom he is in love, because that is the only way by which he can possess her and the only way by which he can free her from a bad woman, her mother. This he declares. Fernande is young, timid, self-distrustful, lovable, and her life *is* her passion for Jacques. He is much older, and has a life behind him which, if a woman had lived it, would have secured for her the designation of "a woman with a Past"—"a woman with a History"—venomously capitalized. He has loved often, always—fervently, sometimes desperately. But these loves are all of the past,—burned out. He has, he believes, discovered unpardonable faults in each of the women once loved. He is exactly in a mood to be drawn to a young creature who has been effectually shielded from any knowledge of life, and who will dream herself away in the romantic fervors of a passion that is content to look at life through her lover's eyes,—no, not that, through her lover's portrayal of life to her. Accidentally she learns that Jacques has loved before, but her mourning over the fact is quieted by his assurance that now he loves only her. Quieted for the time. But all through her married life the shadow of this knowledge haunts her. If Jacques is gloomy, he is thinking of some woman once loved,—so her tormenting thoughts possess her. In truth, he is sometimes reminded by a song, an incident, a scene, of this outlived past; but it is not the cause of his gloom, nor are his thoughts those of her imagining. She has her confidante, Clemence, a foolish woman, taught in a knowledge of the world, but all the more ignorant of this man's heart. She gives her a sympathy that is the fruit of her misconceptions, and helps to widen the growing distance between them. He has his confidante, Sylvia, a wise, and sweet, and brave woman, who is, he believes, his half-sister. Full knowledge of this fact can never come, but the belief effectually withholds him from seeing that he loves her. At last, into their lives, grown sad and dull for Fernande by the torments of her imagination, grown heavy and hard for Jacques through the impossibility of making a child see what only a woman could comprehend, comes Octave, a weak, commonplace, but sufficiently ardent youth, who once loved Sylvia. He becomes enamored of Fernande. When the knowledge of this comes to her, she resists the situation with all the fervor of her innocent heart, enjoins a virtuous renunciation on him, and succeeds in making both herself and him believe that the battle is won. Jacques learns the truth—not the version of their own imaginations, but the truth—that Fernande has grown to love Octave. Satisfying himself fully that these two want only each other, Jacques goes to the forest and throws himself from a precipice. What one wants to find in the book is the conception of a man who can bring firmness and thoughtfulness to bear on a crisis in which deep passion is involved. For Jacques loves Fernande to the last. He gives his life to secure for her the only chance for happiness that the situation offers. The life that he gives is valueless—the valuelessness of life without a great love or a great enthusiasm. For Jacques there had been no good thing worth existing for, apart from a personal love. That there can be no comfort or sustaining power in the mutual love of people who may be half-brother and sister seems a needless yielding to the irony of fate. It is interesting to compare George Sand's Jacques with Tchernychewsky's Lopoukhoff. There are some points of resemblance—the two bad mothers—Fernande and Véra to be freed from them—marriage the necessary means to this end. Lopoukhoff's feigned suicide and Jacques's real suicide have this in common,—that each bears witness to that tenderness without which love does not seem worth talking about. But life had purpose and value for Lopoukhoff, even when Véra's love was no longer a response to his own; while, for Jacques, life's claim on his desire was gone when no woman loved him as a wife loves her husband. I don't think Lopoukhoff's was less—do you? Nor even less intense. Perhaps there is no joy greater than that of helping one grow into the fulness of one's real stature. The pity of it was that Véra stopped growing; that her love became, not cumulative, but substitutory—not a love more, but a love instead. In both stories there is an element which we do not quite like—the comparative helplessness and dependence of both Fernande and Véra in the crises of their lives. Lopoukhoff and Jacques, though suffering equally, are the ones who are strong in thought and action. Lopoukhoff never lost his power of seeing things clearly. And I am afraid it seems "natural"—that is, that we rather expect it. But perhaps, in such times of stress and strain, one of the two is apt to have the strength of the occasion—the strength for both. Perhaps that is, in a way, incidental to the character of the relationship. There was the power of growth in Véra Pavlovna. That ought to count for strength, too. And one likes to read her words to Kirsanoff, three years after: "Sacha, how your love sustains me! It inspires in me the power of independence even against you" Now, I think that is what love will grow to. I am not sure that I will not cherish it as an ideal.

The practical attitude of many men and women of new thought toward love seems at variance with the theoretical attitude. It is as if they let themselves love only under protest, and approve themselves most when they love least. I say "least," because I am thinking of the line: "To divide is not to take away"—the line to which we are all saying "Amen" with our tongues and presumably with our hearts. Do you say: "It is not to add, either, perhaps"? It is quite true that love is neither more nor less than *because* one loves one, or two, or three, or five people. The force of a heart's outgoing is not measured by numbers. But exactly in proportion as you give your love-nature its fling, as if it were an honorable part of your being, you do thereby increase your capacity for loving. Whenever you deliberately refrain from loving anyone whom you find yourself spontaneously drawing near, you do thereby and verily contract your heart. Do not think that there can be a transmutation of the love you might have for the new friend to the friend you call your lover. The passional force of your true nature will enrich all lives, all loves, if you give your heart its way. But it will only shrivel your whole being if you deny its righteousness. And then the dishonesty of this attitude of suppression. You are with your lover, and your thoughts are with another. And you will not let yourself go to this other waiting heart, and say: "I think of you and I love you." Instead, you keep quietly within those encircling arms, saying always to yourself—not aloud—the same refrain: "It is you I wish to love. I love you, and you I wish to love." Véra Pavlovna was honest, and said it aloud. Had she been silent, Lopoukhoff's words must needs have been long delayed: "Remember, my friend, what you said to me on the day of our betrothal: 'You give me liberty.'" And, however great may be your doubt if there be, perchance, Lopoukhoffs in real life, at least command your heart to be honest with itself. But I don't know just how I came into all this. When I began, I was thinking only how easy it was to backslide—how easy it was to get into a rut in loving, just as one does in all the ways and walks of life—how very easy it might sometimes be to mistake the finding ourselves in easy touch with one to whom we are accustomed, for the height and depth of all possible love. Always we are afraid—again afraid—the new heart may fail us—the new love is untried. As if we were not more—if we *let* ourselves be—than anything that can fail us: Love need not be only adjustability—the smooth flow of the great river to the ocean. To those profound and open natures that make room for honest and full expression of every elemental force within them, a single human life becomes as wide-reaching, as limitless, as the ocean.

BERTHA MARVIN.

Thou Shalt Not Kill!

The abominable New York "Journal" prints every Sunday what it calls an "editorial section," which, though purporting to be original matter, is largely made up of articles taken from foreign sources and printed without credit or acknowledgment. Worse than this, the reader is left to infer that the articles thus printed are complete, whereas in reality they consist of mere scraps snatched here and there out of the original and made to fit a certain rectangular space. Thus, on November 11, the "Journal" printed less than one-third of Tolstoi's article on the assassination of Humbert. The entire article appears below, translated from the French as published by "Les Temps Nouveaux":

When kings are executed after trial, as were Charles I, Louis XVI, and Maximilian of Mexico, or when they are killed in palace revolutions, as were Pierre III, Paul, and sundry sultans and shahs, nobody says anything about it, as a rule; but, when they are killed without trial and without a palace revolution, as were Henri IV, Alexander II, the empress of Austria, the shah of Persia, and lately King Humbert, these murders arouse very great astonishment and indignation among kings, emperors, and those who surround them, as if they themselves had never taken part in murders, had never commanded them, had never made use of them. And yet even the best among these assassinated kings, as Alexander II or Humbert, were guilty of having caused or aided tens of thousands of assassinations,—counting only the assassination of those who perished on fields of battle, and saying nothing of the executions occurring within their own countries. As for the kings and emperors endowed with less goodness, they were guilty of hundreds of millions of murders.

The doctrine of Christ abrogates the law, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," but men have always followed it, and still follow it, to a terrifying extent; they do not even confine themselves to applying the principle, "An eye for an eye," but order the murder of thousands of persons without the slightest provocation, as is the case, for instance, when a war is declared. These men therefore, have no right to be indignant when this law is applied to themselves and in so insignificant a measure that, for a hundred thousand, and perhaps even for a million, of persons killed by the order and consent of kings and emperors, scarcely one king or emperor is killed. Not only should kings and emperors not be indignant at such murders as those of Alexander II and Humbert, but they should rather be astonished at the rarity of these murders, in view of the example of continual and general assassination which they set mankind.

The men belonging to the masses are so thoroughly hypnotized that they see what goes on before them without understanding its meaning. They see the pains that kings, emperors, and presidents take to maintain military discipline; they watch the reviews, manœuvres, and parades which these rulers organize and of which they boast in presence of each other; they run eagerly to see their brothers, dressed in laced and motley costumes, clownish costumes, transform themselves, to sound of drum and trumpet, into machines that execute, at the word of a single man, the same movement at the same moment, and they do not understand what this means. And yet the meaning of these exercises is very simple and very clear; they are simply preparations for murder.

It is putting men to sleep in order to make them instruments of murder. And those who do it, who direct these preparations, and who are proud of it, are the kings, the emperors, the presidents. And it is they who, though making a specialty of murder and always wearing military uniforms and instruments of murder, sabres and swords, at their sides, revolt and become indignant when one of their own number is killed.

If the assassinations of kings in general, like that of Humbert in particular, are terrible, it is not because they are cruel and undeserved. The acts executed by the order of kings and emperors, not only in the past,—witness Saint Bartholomew, the religious persecutions, the terrible repressions of the revolts of peasants, and the massacres committed by the Versailles troops,—but also in the present,—witness the capital executions, the slow death in prison cells and disciplinary battalions, the gallows, the guillotine, the volleys and massacres in war,—are incomparably more cruel than the assassinations committed by the Anarchists. It is not, then, because they are undeserved that these assassinations are atrocious. If Alexander II and Humbert did not deserve death, still less did the thousands of Russians who died at Plevna and the thousands of Italians who died in Abyssinia deserve it. If these assassinations are atrocious, it is not because they are cruel and undeserved, but because of the lack of reason in those who commit them.

If the assassins of kings act under the influence of a personal feeling of indignation, provoked by the sufferings of an oppressed people, sufferings for which Alexander, Carnot, or Humbert seem to them to be responsible, or under the influence of a personal feeling of revenge, their acts, however immoral they may be, are comprehensible; but how is it that a whole organization of men, of those who are now called Anarchists,—an organization which, it is said, delegated Bresci and threatens the life of another emperor,—has found no better way to improve the condition of men than to kill persons whose suppression may be as useful as the beheading of that legendary monster which immediately acquires a new head in the place of the head cut off? The kings and emperors long ago established among themselves an organization analogous to the mechanism of those rifles in which the bullet just fired is at once replaced by another. The king is dead: long live the king! Why, then, kill them?

It is only to a superficial observer that the murder of these men can seem a means of safety against the oppression and wars that decimate human lives.

It is sufficient to remember that this oppression and these wars have always taken place independently of those who happened to be at the head of the government—Nicholas or Alexander, Frederick or William, Napoleon or Louis, Palmerston or Gladstone, McKinley or some other,—in order to understand that it is not specific persons who are the cause of this oppression and of these wars by which the peoples suffer. These evils are caused, not by individuals, but by the entire organization of society in which men are so bound together that the fate of all is in the hands of a few or even of a single individual; and these few or this one are so demoralized by this unnatural situation which gives them power over the life and destiny of millions of men that they are always the victims of a morbid state of mind, always more or less smitten with the mania for grandeur,—a mania which passes unnoticed only because of their exceptional situation.

Without even speaking of the fact that from their early childhood and even to the grave these men are surrounded by the most senseless luxury and a constant atmosphere of falsehood and flattery, all their education, all the instruction that they receive, reduces itself to this single thing,—the study of past assassinations, the best means of assassinating at present, the best means of preparing for future assassinations. From their childhood they learn murder in all its possible forms; they always carry on their persons instruments of murder,—sabres and swords; they dress in various uniforms, attend reviews, parades, and manœuvres, pay visits to each other, and bestow decorations and regiments upon each other; and not only is no one found to call these acts by their real name, to tell them that it is criminal and repulsive to make preparations for murder, but they are greeted, on the contrary, with enthusiasm on every hand. Crowds run before them whenever they go out, at each of their reviews, saluting them with enthusiasm, and it seems to them that the entire people is expressing its approval of them. The only portion of the press which they see, and which seems to them to express the sentiments of the entire people or of its best representatives, exalts in a servile fashion all their words and acts, however stupid or wicked they may be. The persons about them,—women, priests, officials,—none of whom add any value to human dignity, rival each other in flattery of them, encouraging them and deceiving them in everything, and thus preventing them from seeing life as it really is. They may live for a hundred years without ever having seen a really free man, without ever having heard a word of truth. Sometimes it terrifies one to listen to these men's words and to consider their acts, but one needs only to carefully reflect upon their situation to understand that in their place every man would act the same.

What, indeed, must be the effect upon the mind of a man like William of Germany, contracted, insufficiently educated, ambitious, having no other ideal than that of a German "Junker," when he sees that there is no word so stupid or revolting that it fails, when uttered by him, to arouse an enthusiastic "*hoch*," be welcomed as something very important, and be commented on by the press of the entire universe. He says that at his command the soldiers must kill even their fathers; they shout: "Hurrah!" He says that the Gospel must be introduced by an iron hand: "Hurrah!" He says that the troops who are going to China must not take any prisoners, but must kill everybody, and, instead of putting him in an insane asylum, they start for China to execute his orders. Or take Nicholas II, who, though modest by nature, begins his reign by declaring to venerable old men that their desire to discuss their own affairs, "self-government," is a senseless dream, and the organs of the press, at least all those that he sees, unite in praising him. He proposes a plan of general peace,—a childish, stupid, and lying plan,—while at the same time ordering an increase in the number of his effective troops, and there is no limit to the praises that they sing to his wisdom and his virtue. He insults and torments an entire people, the Finns, unnecessarily, cruelly, and pitilessly, and again he hears nothing but approval. And finally he organizes the Chinese massacre, revolting in its injustice, in its cruelty, and in the contradiction that it offers to the plan of general peace, and from all sides they praise at the same time his victories and his policy, by which, they say, he continues the peaceful policy of his father.

Under these conditions what must go on in the brains and hearts of these men?

The responsibility for the oppression of peoples and for massacres in war falls consequently, not on Alexander or on Humbert, not on William or Nicholas or Chamberlain, the directors of these oppressions and these massacres, but on those who have put them in a position where they are masters of the lives of other men,—on those who maintain them in this position. What is needed, then, is not the killing of the Alexanders, the Nicholases, the Williams, and the Humberts, but a discontinuance of the support of the social order that produces them. And what sustains the existing social order is the egoism and blindness of the men who sell their liberty and honor for paltry material advantages.

Men placed at the foot of the social ladder, brutalized as they are by a patriotic and pseudo-religious education and moved on the other hand by their personal interest, give up their liberty and their human dignity in favor of those who are placed higher than they and who offer them material advantages. Those who are placed on a little higher round find themselves in the same situation; under the influence of their brutalization, and especially in view of material advantages, they likewise give up to others their liberty and their dignity. It is the same with those who are placed still higher, and this continues up to the highest rounds, until the persons or person at the top are reached. Those at the top have nothing left to acquire, and are moved by one motive only,—ambition and love of power; they are generally so demoralized and brutalized by the power of life and death given them over other men, and by the flattery and platitude with which, for this reason, they are surrounded, that, though doing evil continually, they are persuaded that they are benefiting humanity.

It is the peoples themselves who, in sacrificing their dignity to material advantages, produce these men incapable of acting otherwise than they do act, and then the peoples get angry when these men do stupid or wicked things. To kill them is like first spoiling children and then whipping them.

To prevent further oppression or useless war, and to prevent any one from becoming indignant and killing the parties seemingly responsible, a very little thing would suffice,—namely, that men should understand things as they are and call them by their real names; that they should know that the army is an instrument of murder, and that the act of assembling and directing it—performed with so much assurance by kings, emperors, and presidents—is a preparation for murder.

It would suffice were each emperor or each president to understand that his post as commander of troops is not an important and honorable post, as his flatterers would have him believe, but that such command is a base and shameful act of preparation for murder; it would suffice were every honest man to understand that the payment of taxes to be used in maintaining soldiers, and, all the more then, military service, are not indifferent acts, but bad and shameful acts, for he who performs them not only permits murder, but participates in it himself. Then the power of kings, emperors, and presidents—a power which makes us indignant and on account of which we kill them—would fall of itself.

What is necessary, then, is not to kill the Alexanders, the Carnots, the Humberts, and the others, but to explain to them that they are assassins themselves; it is necessary especially to prevent them from killing men at their command.

And if hitherto men have not acted in this way, it is due solely to the sort of hypnotized state in which governments, by an instinct of self-preservation, carefully keep them. To help to bring about a state of things when men shall neither kill each other or kill kings, it is necessary, not to kill,—for that, on the contrary, can only deepen this hypnotism,—but to awake.

That is what I have tried to do in this short article.

A Commendable Confession of Error.

Some weeks ago the following article, signed by Gertrude Atherton, appeared in the New York "Journal" under the title, "The Suppression of Anarchy":

We have reached an extraordinarily high degree of civilization, a degree which includes sound and effective legislation. How is it, then, that we permit the hatching and educating of Anarchists in our midst? Surely the posterity of a century hence will read history with a disgusted amazement at our inability to cope with what will seem to them a simple question of suppression.

Moralists hold that it is as immoral to sin in thought as in deed, and, as civil law is necessarily founded on the moral precepts, why should it not be a crime to be an Anarchist, whether the perverted wretch has killed a king or not? The very fact that he wants to, that he is constantly imparting his principles to others, that his passionate idea of fame is to have his waxen effigy in Mme. Tussaud's, makes him a pestilential microbe in the world's civilization, which should be bottled for analysis as speedily as possible.

There is more than one way of getting rid of him. If the temperate and humane law-givers of this country and England cannot bring themselves to pass a bill unequivocally stating that any man suspected of being an Anarchist shall be imprisoned until he proves himself innocent, and any proved Anarchist shall be imprisoned for life, surely they need not hesitate to assume that the Anarchist is a lunatic, and, as such, should not be permitted to remain at large.

These poor fools whose twisted brains cannot see that the whole world's tendency is toward law and order, and a higher and higher civilization, which neither their crimes nor their plots can arrest for an instant, seem to me the wildest anomaly of the nineteenth century. It is incredible that they should be allowed to flourish with no worse punishment than police surveillance and the occasional execution of one of their master criminals. Their reward would appear to be a newspaper notoriety which no virtuous section of the community ever attains, and in which they doubtless revel. When one reflects that these material spots could be as thoroughly disinfected as a cholera ship, one wonders what on earth the law-makers are about, and why no senator of the United States, at all events, is not far-sighted enough to seize the chance to immortalize himself, to say nothing of that sense of duty to his country which he has manifested so often.

It is all very well to talk about a "free country." What about the freedom of the millions who are law-abiding, and who will indubitably suffer if the Anarchists become strong in numbers?—as, indeed, they did suffer during the great Pullman strike of 1894, when there was

an Anarchist in the governor's mansion of Illinois. What of "the greatest good of the greatest number"? What of that other popular maxim: "Self-protection is the first law of nature"?

Those who are chosen by the people to make the laws are expected to protect those who give them office, and yet they read the sensational accounts of Anarchist colonies and Anarchist crimes year after year and never put a finger to a bill for the protection of the men whom the laws of inheritance or their own conspicuous abilities elevate above the heads of the masses. Kings and presidents are slain, and only the European States make an attempt to cope with the evil. The two great Anglo-Saxon countries, which are likewise the most highly civilized on earth, wish to prove their superior humanity and broad-mindedness by the conspicuous encouragement of insane criminals.

Police surveillance is not enough, for not only are policemen known to be human and venal, but such restraint upon a great evil is too negative in its moral effect. Once let these lunatics know that they are all in danger of becoming martyrs immediately, and therefore that individual fame is no longer possible, and they will either cease to be lunatics, or skulk about, solitary and innocuous, until they are wearing stripes and short hair. Unless this comes to pass and quickly, England and the United States will go down to posterity as two overgrown babies, incapable of self-protection.

Some time later there appeared in the "Journal" a second article from the same pen, which is also reproduced here to bring the writer's change of view into bold relief:

I have received quite a number of letters from unknown correspondents since I began to write for the "Journal." As a rule I do not read them, for they are almost invariably from Socialists, and ill-spelled. The first one, I have inferred, was a type of the rest; it consisted of four pages of vituperation, and concluded thus: "But, as I suppose it is no use to cast my pearls before swine, I will now stop." Of course, such effusions are merely intended as safety-valves for the writer, and, being of no earthly use to the recipient, are not worth reading.

The other day, however, I received a typewritten letter from a western city, and I saw at a glance that it was from a gentleman. Consequently I read it through. It took me to task for misusing the word Anarchist, for applying it to the poor, deluded fools who assassinate rulers out of what they have persuaded themselves is a desire for a Utopian civilization, but which is merely a shrieking personal hatred of all who have what they have not.

I have written and acknowledged that I misused a word, which, when coined, was perhaps the greatest word in any language, but explained that, as the original meaning is practically forgotten, I might be pardoned for using it in its present and general adaptation.

This, however, my correspondent will not have. He is an Anarchist in the great and philosophical sense himself, and, while he can stand the perversion of the word by the ignorant, holds any intelligent person to account for perpetuating the misuse of a word that the best intellects carefully preserve in all the greatness of its first meaning.

But it is extraordinary how few, even among the clever and educated people, who are sown so thickly in this country, know that Anarchy, as Proudhon expounded it, means but the government of self by self, the training of the human character and mind to such a state of moral perfection that there will be no inclination to break the laws which have been invented to protect society from the selfish and half-civilized tendencies of man; consequently that the laws themselves must become as obsolete as unnecessary.

We are not as far from this ideal condition of things as may be imagined, for thousands of the higher civilization are now so well trained that it no more occurs to them to break the laws than to remember there are laws to break, and, as my Anarchist points out, all churches are run on purely Anarchistic principles; nobody is forced to join, nobody to remain against his will, each pays what he can. And so it is of clubs, with the exception of fixed dues, to which all agree. Certain it is that the higher one goes in the scale of civilization the more flexible are the laws, and the more highly are honor and veracity held in esteem.

On the other hand, there is no question that, the more highly civilized man becomes, the more impatient he is of restraint. The highest intelligences are Anarchistic, and, when a man knows that what he has inherited from law-abiding ancestors, and what his own wide knowledge of the world has taught him, have made him a well-balanced intellect, independent of the laws made for the mob, he would be the first to rebel if suddenly transferred to a community still governed by a network of niggling and intrusive laws.

But such men—in the Anglo-Saxon race, at all events—live in enlightened communities, and are rarely sensible of the yoke—except, perhaps, when they drive a "bubble" more rapidly than the law allows, or drink too much in the wrong place. They may break other laws, but their superior experience, to say nothing of this refinement, teaches them to avoid publicity, and that is all the law asks of them. The law of large communities is not intrusive; it makes all allowances for human nature, and is only inexorable to the crudeness and the vulgarity of vice. Our laws are a practical education for that final Anarchy to which the thousands of thoughtful Anarchists now in the world look forward.

Surely, therefore, this fine word should be wrested from the brutal and illiterate breed, of which the Paterson gang are eloquent examples. Would not the word maniarchist do?

That these people should be swept off the face of the earth like noisome vermin I still maintain. They are the plague-laden rats, poisoning and rotting the cellars of society. It is for such that the law was made, and should be exerted in its full force.

The Really Dangerous Anarchist.

[Dr. Stanton Coit.]

The Anarchistic dynamitard is foolish in his inefficiency compared to his more subtle accomplice who does nothing criminal. The kind of enemy to government which every State, church, political organization, or Ethical Union has to fear and systematically to guard against is the demure, alert, quiet young man or woman who pushes his or her way to the front in the government of any society, in order, from this vantage-ground, to check at every turn, in a thousand scarcely noticeable ways, the orderly procedure of majority-control, and to arrest the growth of any organization beyond the narrowest local extent. The non-dynamite-throwing Anarchist is the most dangerous of all enemies to the State. But in the highest degree he is a menace to a State that is democratic, and to every private organization where a majority-vote is expected to constrain the minority into submission. Democratic methods give the peaceful Anarchist his chance. No lamb of democracy looks more demure and faithful than this wolf in sheep's clothing. He—or generally she—never misses a meeting. He is always ready to spend any amount of valuable time in private conversation to win over the humblest, and especially the pettiest, minds to his resentment of all governmental control, and all expansion of majority-organizations. He—although not generally he—seldom calls himself an Anarchist; he is at most an "Individualist," and is a champion of "individuals" against the wish and purpose of every majority. As he flatters individuals,—especially insignificant units,—so he panders to all narrow, merely local, interests as opposed to wide and national concerns. He feeds sectional pride at the expense of national; national at the cost of world-wide federation.

A Chambermaid's Diary.

By OCTAVE MIRBEAU.

Translated from the French by BENJ. R. TUCKER.

A French chambermaid, who has served in the houses of the nobility, of professional people, and of the *bourgeoisie*, secures a position in a country-house, and there begins the keeping of her diary. In describing her daily experiences and the people about her, she is often reminded of episodes in her past, and thus, by frequent digressions, reviews her entire career. She mercilessly tears away the veils that conceal all sorts of crimes, foibles, prejudices, and fads in the various strata of society, so that her recital becomes a terrific social exposure, a grim social satire, crammed with humor, bitterness, and truth.

The author describes his book as filled with "the sadness that makes lofty souls laugh, the comicality that makes them weep."

A French critic declares that "the purpose of the work seems to be to show that nearly all the masters are low-lived wretches, and that nearly all the servants are as near like them as they know how to be."

The French original, published in August, 1900, has already reached its 130th edition.

A handsomely-printed volume of 460 pages.

Cloth, $1.25; paper, 50 cents.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher:

BENJ. R. TUCKER, P. O. Box 1312, New York City.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York.

STATE SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ. By Benj. R. Tucker. The opening chapter of "Instead of a Book" reprinted separately. The best pamphlet with which to meet the demand for a compact exposition of Anarchism. 33 pages. Single copy, 5 cents; 10 copies, 28 cents; 100 copies, $2.40.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING. Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium, and how interest on money can be abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 10 cents.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or, an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a sketch of Proudhon's life and works. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, thorough, and radical discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a detailed and startling *exposé* of the crimes which it commits and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages, octavo. Price, cloth, $2.00; paper, $1.20.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN. Being a protest against government of man by man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. By John Henry Mackay. Translated from the German by George Schumm. 315 pages, with portrait of the author. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUTUALISTIC, and Financial Fragments. By William B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. By Lysander Spooner. 24 pages. Price, 10 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. II. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 15 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of no authority. By Lysander Spooner. 59 pages. Price, 25 cents.

A BLOW AT TRIAL BY JURY. By Benj. R. Tucker. An examination of the special jury law passed by the New York legislature in 1896. A speech delivered at a mass meeting held in Cooper Union under the auspices of several labor organizations. 48 pages. Price, 5 cents.

VOLUNTARY SOCIALISM. By F. D. Tandy. A complete and systematic outline of Anarchistic philosophy and economics, written in a clear, concise, and simple style. Containing a list of books of service to those who wish to study the subject more deeply. 228 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

THE THIRTY-SIX TRADES OF THE STATE. By Arsène Alexandre. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. Showing the State as a jack-at-all-trades and good at none. Single copy, 3 cents; 10 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 80 cents.

THE BALLAD OF READING GAOL. By C. 3. 3. (Oscar Wilde). A poem of more than 600 lines, dedicated to the memory of a trooper of the Horse Guards who was hanged in Reading Gaol during the poet's confinement there. An English classic. The cloth edition has covers of blue and vellum, and is beautifully printed from large type on hand-made antique deckle-edge paper. 96 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 10 cents.

THE BALLOT. By William Walstein Gordak. A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. An excellent leaflet for propagandism. 100 copies, 10 cents.

PROUDHON AND HIS "BANK OF THE PEOPLE." By Chas. A. Dana. Being a defence of the great French Anarchist, showing the evils of a specie currency, and that interest on capital can and ought to be abolished by a system of free and mutual banking. Price 10 cents; leatherette, 25 cents.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of

BENJ. R. TUCKER,

EDITOR OF LIBERTY.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 524 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Cloth, One Dollar; Paper, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

What is Anarchism?

An explanation by Stephen T. Byington. 5 copies for 2 cents, 50 for 10 cents, 150 for 25 cents, 750 for $1. Postage paid Address Stephen T. Byington, Westport, Mass.